



UNITED STAND DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS/ Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	TION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR			ATTORNEY DOCKET NO		
09/224,340	12/31/98	DIMARCO		M	A62	:-17022-US
_				EXAMINER		
		MMC2/1003	,	ro ribarii i		
JOHN G SHUDY JR HONEYWELL INC				DINH.		PAPER NUMBER
HONEYWELL PI MN12 8251 MINNEAPOLIS	LAZA P O BO			2841 Date Maile	D:	
					1.	1/03/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/224,340	DIMARCO, MARIO
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit
		Tuan T Dinh	2841
	- The MAILING DATE of this communic	cation appears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address
eriod fo	• •	NO DEDLY 10 CET TO EXPIRE 11	AONTH(S) EDOM
THE N - Exten after S - If the - If NO - Failur - Any re	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FC MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNIC sions of time may be available under the provisions of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commuperiod for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) period for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply weply received by the Office later than three months afted patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CATION. If 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a unication. It is a reply within the statutory minimum of thi utory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO will by statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on <u>15 August 2001</u> .	
2a)	This action is FINAL . 2	b)⊠ This action is non-final.	
3)	Since this application is in condition closed in accordance with the practi	for allowance except for formal ma ce under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C	atters, prosecution as to the merits is .D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Dispositi	on of Claims		
4) 🖂	Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-24 is/are pending	g in the application.	
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/ard	e withdrawn from consideration.	
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)	Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-24 is/are rejected		
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restrict	tion and/or election requirement.	
Applicati	on Papers		
9)[The specification is objected to by the	Examiner.	
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are:	a) accepted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.
	Applicant may not request that any obje		
11) 🔲 -	The proposed drawing correction filed		disapproved by the Examiner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are req		
,	The oath or declaration is objected to	by the Examiner.	9.
-	ınder 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		
•	Acknowledgment is made of a claim	for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C	, § 119(a)-(d) or (t).
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:		
	•	documents have been received.	
	_	documents have been received in	
* 6	3. Copies of the certified copies of the certified copies of application from the Internation action detailed Office action	of the priority documents have bee ational Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)) n for a list of the certified copies no	
			c. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
a) The translation of the foreign lan Acknowledgment is made of a claim for the contract of th	guage provisional application has	been received.
. تىرە. Attachmen			
1) Notice 2) Notice	te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (Pignation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Pa	TO-948) 5) Notice of	w Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 2841

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Prosecution Application

The request filed on August 15, 2001 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 14 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-2, 13, 16-17, 19-20, and 23-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by McCarthy et al (U.S. Patent 4,736,274).

As to claims 1, 13, 23, 24, McCarthy discloses an enclosure (10-figure 1, column 5, line 14) consider as an integrated modular cabinet as shown in figures 1-11 comprising:

a plurality of printed circuit board (PCB) modules (18-figure 1, column 5, line 22), and a chassis (R, figure 1A), wherein each PCB module (18) include a faceplate (figures 7-11, column 9, line 11), and a connector assembly (38, column 5, line 55) disposed opposite said faceplate such that PCB module is enclosure; and

a chassis (14-figures 1-2, column 5, line 19 comprising top, bottom, and side walls, wherein said front (see figures 2-6) of said chassis (14) is configured with slots (50, column 6, lines 4-5) for receiving said plurality of PCB modules (18), wherein said

Art Unit: 2841

PCB modules (18) creates a seal with said chassis (see figures 4-6), and wherein said seal is resistant to EMI (column 4, lines 44-62, column 6, lines 36-48, and column 8, lines 14-37, 54-57, 62-66).

As to claim 2, McCarthy discloses the cabinet as shown in figure 7, wherein each of said plurality of PCB module (18) further comprising:

said faceplate having first and second ends; and

first and second screws (118, column 9, line 7) attached to the first and second ends.

As to claims 16-17, McCarthy discloses the cabinet as shown in figures 2-6 wherein said top and bottom panels are configured with a plurality of ventilation holes (55-figure 3) for cooling said PCB modules (81), and wherein said ventilation holes are sized to be resistant to EMI and RFI..

As to claims 19-20, McCarthy discloses the cabinet as shown in figures 2-3 wherein said top and bottom panel are configured with a plurality of guide rails (76, column 7, line 9) and each of one guide rail mounted on the top and bottom panels...

Art Unit: 2841

Page 4

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 14-15, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCarthy.

As to claims 14-15, McCarthy discloses and satisfies all of the limitation of the claimed invention, except for showing the interchangeable of the top and bottom panels and two side of the panels, where a part of the cabinet may be relocated without modification to the operation of the cabinet, such a relocation is considered to have been within the skill of art. *In re Japikse*, 86 USPQ 70 (1950).

As to claim 18, McCarthy discloses the cabinet including the hole and satisfies all of the limitation of the claimed invention, except for the size of the hole. It would have been obvious matter of design choice to make as small (diameter) as possible to reduce the amount of space, since such a modification would have involved a mere change in this size of the hole. The change in size is generally recognized as being within the level of ordinary skill in the art. *In re Rose*, 105 USPQ 237 (CCPA 1955).

Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCarthy in view of Craker (U. S. Patent 4,716,497).

Art Unit: 2841

As to claims 3-4, McCarthy discloses all of the limitations of the claimed invention, except for the first and second screws is jackscrews and configured to clutch. Cracker teaches the module having a faceplate (22) including the screw (60) configured as jackscrew and clutch for fastening the printed circuit board module to the cabinet.

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the screws of McCarthy and provide the jack-screw and clutch as taught by Craker in order to fasten the module slide into the enclosure.

As to claim 5, McCarthy and Craker disclose and satisfy the claimed invention except for the predetermined amount of force is about 70 pounds per screw. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the force to fastening the screw on the module for secured the module within cabinet, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

Claims 6-7 and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCarthy in view of Craker and further in view of Martin (U. S. Patent 5,424,916).

McCarthy and Craker do not show the module having first and second printed circuit boards connected to the connector assembly without using ribbon cables. The connectors with surface mounted leads at position 90 degrees. Martin shows a module (30) having first and second printed circuit boards (32-34-figure 2) connected to a connector assembly (50) with 90 degrees lead and without using ribbon cables.

Art Unit: 2841

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cabinet of McCarthy and Craker and provide the module having more than one circuit board connected to the connector assembly as taught by Martin in order to reduce a connection between two boards and backplane connector of the cabinet.

Claims 12 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCarthy in view of Craker and further in view of McKenzie (U. S. Patent 4,002,386).

McCarthy and Craker disclose and satisfy all of the claimed invention, except for the flexible handle mounted on the faceplate of the module. McKenzie teaches the flexible handle (24) as shown in figures 2 and 3.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the cabinet of McCarthy and Craker and provide the flexible handle as taught by McKenzie in order to use to remove the module from the cabinet.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 and 9-24 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tuan T Dinh whose telephone number is 703-306-5856. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

Art Unit: 2841

Page 7

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Gaffin can be reached on 703-308-3301. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-3431 for regular communications and 703-308-3431 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

TD September 25, 2001

> Jayprakash N. Gandhi Primary Examiner Technology Center 2800